1858 The Daily Colonist. 1959

"An Independent Newspaper, The Organ of No Clique or Party"

SETH HALTON, Publisher — SANDHAM GRAVES, Editor-in-Chief

Published every morning except Monday by the Colonist Publishers Ltd. at 2631 Douglas Street, Victoria, B.C.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1959

Canadian Defence

IT has been patent all along of course that in any future conflict threatening the soil of North America much would depend on the resources of the U.S. armed forces. Geography and economics made that plain enough. It was expected however that Canada would do the utmost she could in defence of her own soil, and that it would not be necessary to abdicate any of these rightful responsibilities. Announcement by Defence Minister Pearkes that American interceptors will take over the protection of Western Canada is therefore cause for some dismay.

The situation is not without contradictions. The Avro cancellation was defended on the ground that missiles made manned aircraft obsolete, yet it is U.S. manned fighter craft which will occupy the military airfields in the west. A natural question therefore is why the RCAF should not do this duty, the one above all else for which it is trained and constituted.

The answer will be that it is too costly for Canada to protect its own soil; but this is too easy a way out. No other nation shifts the burden to an ally in so sweeping a fashion, and few are so young, vigorous or possessed of such natural resources as this country. Any concept of defence which resigns itself to dependency in such large degree is not comforting to national pride. Americans themselves must wonder at the attitude of Canada in this respect.

It is ironical that even in the crucial struggle of the last war this nation stood on its own feet and paid its own way. Now the government is content to let the U.S. pay for arming the air force with Bomarc missiles, and has arranged for American planes to cross the border and assume the defence of half the country. Is that what Canada wants? No doubt this will save Canadians dipping further into their pockets to protect their own land, but inevitably it will tend to a certain loss of sovereignty and perhaps even to political subordination in matters of defence. Surely Canada should be more self-reliant.

When Help Is Needed

ALL across Canada this week voluntary workers on behalf of the Red Cross began making their annual approach to the people of the various communities for the funds needed to enable the world-wide organization to carry on its magnificent work for another year. The appeal was launched quietly, because the Red Cross does not employ high-pressure methods, relying on the public to give willingly, just as the Red Cross gives its services willingly wherever and whenever they are needed. That reliance never yet has proved to be misplaced. The Red Cross, of the many welfare organizations in existence today, is one which can always count on grateful recognition.

After half a century of unfailing service in Canada the Red Cross is in the happy position of being able to allow its good works to speak for themselves; and they speak more volubly than any lip service to its splendid efforts ever could. Internationally, nationally, in cities, towns and isolated regions where human beings are in serious trouble the Red Cross can always be depended upon for help when it is most needed. Its record is one of the brightest pages in the history of human progress, and its familiar badge has become the symbol of charity in its truest form.

Those men and women who wear the uniform and insignia of the Red Cross give their services without expectation of reward, but the wide scope of Red Cross activities creates heavy expense which can be met only through financial support from the people. This year British Columbia is asked for $690,000, Greater Victoria for the relatively modest total of $79,000. Balanced against the good work it will help to make possible, that is little to ask of the people of a prosperous and comfortably situated community, and one may feel confident that this region will respond generously, as it has done before.

A Racing Commission

A PUBLIC bill to establish a permanent racing commission in British Columbia, under provincial auspices and subject to specific powers, has been laid before the Legislature by Attorney-General Bonner. It is a proclamation measure which would become effective when proclaimed by the lieutenant-governor, presumably after essential preparations for the setting up of such a commission with its necessary staff. If the measure is assented to by the House, the commission would be placed under the department of the attorney-general and report once a year to the Legislature.

The terms of the proposed measure are self-explanatory. Its enactment would bring horse racing in British Columbia and the operation of racing tracks under regulation by a commission; with powers of inspection and licensing, and penalties for non-compliance; though the bill details neither fees nor penalties. The commission would operate under a chairman and vice-chairman and additional members, and a civil service staff. On the regulatory side, it would have power to subpoena witnesses, examine books and generally supervise the operation of race tracks within the province.

Other than the creation of a British Columbia Racing Commission with the intention of regulating horse racing on a uniform and permanent basis there are no surprise proposals in the measure as introduced in the House. Most of the actual powers to be given to the regulating body are set forth expressly in the bill. Others again depend on provincial regulations by order-in-council to be set out later if the Legislature consents to go ahead with the plan.

The need for some unified authority to regulate racing in B.C. has been urged for some time; both for the over-all protection of the public, and also for the forward development such a step would bring to horse breeding within the province. With a growing population and an increasing number of tracks, the existing means of supervision are being outmoded.

Interpreting the News

Macmillan Makes Point

By GEORGE KITCHEN
Canadian Press Staff Writer

COMMENTATORS in the United States have been blowing both hot and cold on the Macmillan mission to Moscow.

Some have been rushing into print to headline it as a failure, and to try to draw a parallel between it and Chamberlain's ill-fated mission to Munich in 1938.

Others have conceded that it may develop into a limited success. It is probably too early for a full-dress assessment, but the chances are that it will have more positive than negative effects on current East-West jockeying over the German question generally and the Berlin issue in particular.

* * *

The first indications of this can be read into Monday's Moscow dispatches reporting that the Soviet Union has agreed to Western proposals for a foreign ministers' meeting on the Berlin crisis.

This runs counter to what Premier Khrushchev said just a few days ago when he addressed a Moscow political meeting and threw cold water on the West's proposal that the foreign ministers get together to try to break the Berlin deadlock.

Some Western observers feel that much of the credit for the change in Khrushchev's attitude goes to the British prime minister who, during his 10-day stay in the Soviet Union, has hammered away at the theme of negotiations as a means of settling the Berlin dispute.

* * *

It can be argued that Macmillan's repeated arguments finally began to sink in on the Kremlin leaders.

Also, Macmillan has been able to do what no other Western statesman has been able to accomplish in recent years—give Khrushchev and his aides a first-hand assessment of the West's determination to maintain access to West Berlin. The Russians have threatened to pull out of there May 27 and turn their functions and authority over to the East German government.

The British Scene... by Giles

"Do you want to end up as a Guardsman's hat outside Buckingham Palace?"

Thinking Aloud

". . . of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—of cabbages and kings."

By TOM TAYLOR

A correspondent in Alberni suggests that since man has taken such trouble in this century to imitate the birds he doesn't think we need worry about the air force going out of fashion. I applaud this thought, remembering that man is inherently conservative and doesn't like change no matter how he keeps up with modern things.

My reader cites in support of the enduring quality of airmen a recent review in his city of air cadets by the Lieutenant-Governor. These cadets, he says, held their own well with their kinsmen of the army and the navy. I once was an army man but I wouldn't doubt that for a moment. My own eyes have seen adult airmen perform on the ground with as much elan as any military contingent.

* * *

Mind you, I accept such equality of marching skill only against the grain. Once a footslogger always a footslogger, in bias anyway, and it doesn't seem right that an airman should be as good on his feet as a soldier, who once at least travelled on nothing else but. One's chagrin is compounded also by knowledge that the soldier could not so readily match the airman in the air.

Of course he could be trained for it, in time. The airman enjoys the advantage here, for he gets initial training on parade ground niceties. So does a sailor, which only adds to my confusion. My thinking in this direction is quite illogical, anyway. If it is difficult to accept the airman as an exponent of foot-drill it is even harder to think of a sailor in this connection. Yet frequently the latter performs publicly in Victoria to correct my prejudice, and extremely well too. When the RCN band does its stuff, for instance, I am hard put to it to think of a better drilled formation. There is no trace either of the rolling gait traditionally associated with sailors, which I now conclude must be one of those legends one never sees in the flesh.

This being the age it is I dare not omit some reference to the feminine division of the tri-services, who also, paradoxically though it might seem to any soldier, can strut to advantage in column of route or in any other guise. Indeed it is a lingering memory that the neatest, most meticulous formation in the victory parade in London in 1945, according to photographs I studied carefully, was a company of girls!

* * *

I have recollection, too, of seeing some Fiji Islanders on parade a few years ago and they seemed the epitome of military smartness, albeit they were only a small squad and that helps. It is when troops advance in review order, let us say, that the strain appears. Even the famed London guardsmen at a Trooping the Color ceremony show deviations, it being pretty well impossible for a long line of men to move forward as evenly as a ruler.

I mention the British guards only because I haven't yet seen the post-war creation of Canadian guards in motion. It is high time they came out to the West Coast, by the way, to let us have a look at them. Or, failing that, the National Film Board might make a film showing them on parade and distribute it across the country. Then I'd know if they, being soldiers, can hold their own with airmen.

Talking about airmen again, if missiles are to encroach on the RCAF's real metier, a few squadrons might well be kept for ceremonial flying. An aerial trooping ceremony, or some similar spectacular affair, would remind us of what is lost when missiles displace the knights of the air.

Letter from London

Cyprus: a Triumph for Violence

By RICHARD L. THOMAS

DRIVING down London's still posh Park Lane on the top of a bus we stopped outside the Dorchester, London's smartest hotel. There was a magnificent array of coppers the like of which has not been seen since Bulge and Krush came to Britain from the frozen atmosphere of Russia. The reason for the assembly (and the many plain-clothes men within the hotel) was the presence therein of Archbishop Makarios.

"How British!" said a fellow traveller. "Two months ago they would gladly have helped him to slip on a banana skin."

It was the eve of the Cyprus settlement. That afternoon a gentleman had applied at Bow Street magistrate's court for a warrant for the arrest of the archbishop for aiding and abetting murder. The application was refused—in itself an unusual proceeding because it behooves anyone to lay an information provided he is prepared to take the consequences, which include actions for malicious prosecution, perjury and similar issues arising from frivolous prosecutions. True, a magistrate has to be satisfied that there is some evidence to support the charge which prima facie exists in government white papers on Cyprus.

* * *

Anyway the archbishop was not arrested. On the contrary he was guarded by a phalanx of police. Next day the settlement was announced, and not very many people were proud of it. Indeed many are already asking whether it is a settlement; the rumblings from Cyprus suggest otherwise. If the Greeks are satisfied, the Turks certainly are not and it is patently obvious that Britons on the island will not get very far, and the sovereignty of the island bases reserved by Britain seems to be more in the nature of a face-saving formula than a practical achievement.

Regretfully one must presume that it is the sort of settlement which results in gang warfare when the police withdraw. Anarchy and despotism triumph regardless of which gang succeeds in annihilating the other.

The real tragedy of the settlement in Cyprus, however, is that it is a triumph for violence. It implies that if you are prepared to be sufficiently aggressive and to kill enough people and to make a mockery of law and order then you will win your point. It is an encouragement to incipient violence anywhere. One can hear already faint cries of "What Cyprus can do, we can do." Next come the shots, the massacre of children and women out shopping, the police and the troops.

The so-called Christian archbishop by encouraging violence has won his points. True, he has to live with his conscience, but all the evidence shows that it is reasonably elastic, and that his venom once reserved for the British will now be transferred to the Turkish minority. It is not surprising that Turkish Cypriots are apprehensive and have already accused Britain of letting them down. Britain secured a formula which enables them to pass the buck—to the prime minister of Turkey who approved the settlement.

* * *

For nearly 50 years Cyprus has been British. It means that every Cypriot over 45 years old, anyway, is a British subject by birth. If Cyprus becomes an independent nation outside the Commonwealth it will mean that tens of thousands will have been deprived of British nationality without consultation, 55,000 of them resident in the United Kingdom. It will mean that another small portion of the Commonwealth has been given away and that, in principle anyway, anyone with a grievance who can get hold of a gun has been given the green light.

Any moral justification for the settlement has surely been abrogated by the fact that the Cypriots themselves have not been consulted, and that agreement was reached without the citizens of the island being consulted. True, many are relieved by the thought that the days of pestilent violence are over, but they may well have to think again. There are strong elements in Cyprus who do not approve the settlement. If they start a new reign of terror who will attempt to keep the peace?

* * *

Possibly more humiliating than the settlement is the realization that the Cyprus situation need never have arisen had it not been for bungling of the Colonial Office. It seems fairly obvious that they have bungled again in the case of Malta and if ever Mr. Mintoff was offered encouragement for violence the Cyprus settlement provides it.

The most that can be said of the agreement with Cyprus is that Britain has not surrendered her bases. If anyone cares to contemplate the value of bases surrounded by actual or implied hostility they have only to ponder events in the Suez canal. The formula was tried there and ended in making humility more confounded.

Burgeoning Bureaucracy

More Government Snooping

(From The Calgary Albertan)

LATEST example of unwarranted government snooping into private affairs, according to the Financial Post, is a demand from Ottawa that the chartered banks provide a monthly list of firms and individuals who are substantial borrowers.

The banks are concerned, as well they might be, over this intrusion on the privacy of their clients and they are at a loss to understand why Ottawa would legitimately need this kind of information.

It is standard practice for the banks to supply the government with monthly reports on loan figures for statistical purposes. This is the sort of information on which government statisticians feed and flourish and it is a harmless pursuit. But naming names is something entirely different and, as one banker puts it, "the possibilities for grave abuse and misuse of such information are appalling."

The banks, apparently, intend to make "strong representations" against the scheme. We would suggest that they do much more than this. They should simply refuse to supply the information and tell the government snooper who dreamed up the idea to go to the devil. So far as we are aware there is no law requiring such information to be supplied and before any such law is passed it should get a thorough airing in Parliament.

If some government agency feels that it needs to know exactly how much any individual or firm has borrowed it can go to the courts and attempt to get a legal order requiring the bank to supply the information. The bank and the individual or firm concerned can show cause why the information should not be divulged and the court can make a decision based on law.

With the banks kicking up a fuss and the scheme getting some publicity which the official who dreamed it up probably hadn't counted on, there is a good chance that the request for the information will be quietly withdrawn. We hope it isn't. We would like to see a good knock-down, drag-out fight on this latest example of the burgeoning interest of bureaucracy in matters which are none of its concern; we would like to see questions asked in the House about this; we would like the government to give some sort of assurance that the official responsible would be severely censured and that governmental Paul Prys would be told to mind their own business.

The Packsack

Of GREGORY CLARK

MOTORING with a native midwesterner in the Chicago region and round about other small cities in that area, I saw several examples of what we call housing developments that had been built a number of years ahead of the Canadian ventures in this direction. And they had, in fifteen years or so, become pretty sad looking communities.

"They are," said my companion, "nothing more or less than detached tenements."

And that is exactly what they looked like—shabby, untidy, neglected, slummy, with hardly a vestige of the attractive, pretty box charm they had when first built and offered to a house-hungry generation soon after the war.

"They have been grief to everybody concerned," said my companion. "The financial interests that backed the ventures suffered serious loss. The construction people and builders were discredited. The original buyers lost their money."

I supposed that cheap materials and mass-produced fixtures and equipment, plumbing, doors, windows and so forth, had been the secret of the decline.

"Only partly," said my companion. "Fifteen years ago there was not the understanding there is today of the importance of a community spirit in these housing enterprises. Community pride is the secret of the survival of these ventures. One, two or three sloppy householders can ruin a street. One sloppy street can ruin a subdivision. A little pride in the premises can do wonders for the financial security of a whole community."

Fun, Fact and Fiction

The woman was charged with stealing goods from a large store during the Christmas rush. She was of the respectable type and it seemed a case of kleptomania. The magistrate was inclined to be lenient and asked the prisoner if she had anything to say on her behalf.

"Well," she said hopefully, "I only take British goods."

* * *

A student, having been asked to define capital punishment, replied thus:

"Capital punishment is when the government taxes you to get capital so that it can go into competition with you, and then taxes the profits on your business in order to pay its losses."